**Amendments to the Drawings**

Replacement sheets for Figs. 1-6 are enclosed which formalize the drawings which were submitted with the application. No other changes have been made.

## REMARKS

Applicants submit herewith replacement sheets for Figs. 1-6 which formalize the drawings on file. Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Applicants affirm the electron made on November 17, 2005 by the undersigned of Group 1, Claims 1-17.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 8-14 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsueh et al (USPAB 2002/0139666) in view of Brody et al (US Patent 6943066). Claims 4, 5, 15 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsueh et al (USPAB 2002/0139666) in view of Brody et al (US Patent 6943066) and further in view of Shtein et al (US Patent 6716656).

Claims 1 and 11 are the only independent claims remaining in this application. Claim 1 is directed to the situation where there is at least one deposition chamber and Claim 11 has at least two deposition chambers. As amended claims 1 and 11 require the shadowmask to have openings (see Figs. 3a-3e) so that an organic layer is deposited onto at least one device region and one test region on the substrate. These regions are separated.

In Hsueh et al a process is shown whereby a spinning substrate is coated. A sputtering process is described. On page 2, paragraph 0023 et seq. a multifingered shadowmask is set forth. Monitoring areas 50-56 are spaced from the center of the substrate. What these monitoring areas do is measure the film transmittance at several different radii for annular regions. There is no corresponding arrangement to spaced apart test regions and device regions on the substrate. All of the regions are device regions in Hsueh et al. Hsueh et al measures thicknesses of a deposited device layer while it is being formed. Clearly, the structure in Hsueh et al is very different than that in claims 1 and 11. There are no opening in what Hsueh et al call a shadowmask. What Hsueh et al do is to control the deposition rate in different annular regions on their device substrate. Here again they do not have or provide any motivation for separately depositing material in a device region and a test region. Moreover, their arrangement cannot provide material in spaced apart regions as it is a continuous coating on the entire surface of the substrate in the form of a rotating disk.

Applicants cannot see how the Hsueh et al arrangement can even be modified to provide the present invention.

Brody et al relates to forming electronic elements on a substrate. Brody et al uses a shadowmask with openings (see Fig. 2). In Fig. 2, Applicants cannot find any opening which would correspond to a spaced apart test region on a substrate. Although Brody does test devices, Applicants believe that they test device regions and not spaced apart test regions. Applicants fail to see how the Brody et al shadowmask with opening can be used to adjust deposition rate as in Hsueh et al.

Shtein et al was cited as teaching a vacuum pressure less than 0.001 Pa. Nothing in Shtein et al discloses the features in claim 1 and claim 11 as discussed above.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/das
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-4653
Facsimile: 585-477-4646
If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.